Why Cognitive Linguists Should Care About the Slavic Languages And Vice Versa.

Divjak, Dagmar

DOI:
10.1515/9783110198799.0.1

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Divjak, D 2007, Why Cognitive Linguists Should Care About the Slavic Languages And Vice Versa. in D Divjak & A Kochanska (eds), *Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain.* De Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198799.0.1

Why Cognitive Linguists Should Care about the Slavic Languages and Vice Versa.

Dagmar Divjak, Laura A. Janda and Agata Kochańska

1. The Cognitive Paradigm and Slavic Linguistic Research

From its early days, cognitive linguistics has attracted the attention of linguists with research interests in Slavic languages (to name but a few Cienki 1989, Dąbrowska 1997, Janda 1993a; Rudzka-Ostyn 1992 and 1996). In recent years this interest has rapidly expanded, as can be witnessed from the establishment of the Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association, the Russian Cognitive Linguistics Association, and the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association as well as by the five Slavic Cognitive Linguistics conferences held at various venues in Europe and North America over the last seven years.

This is not surprising, for at least two reasons. First, one of the founding assumptions of cognitive linguistics has been present in Slavic linguistics all along: Slavic linguists have always recognized the fundamentally symbolic nature of language and hence the fact that diverse formal aspects of language exist for the purpose of conveying meaning. One striking illustration of the close affinities between cognitive linguistics and ideas formulated within traditional Slavic linguistics comes from the relatively early days of modern linguistic research on Slavic languages. In a study devoted to the nature of the contrast between the perfective and the imperfective aspect in Polish, a German Slavicist, Erwin Koschmieder (1934), proposed two conceptualizations of time which could easily be paraphrased as involving either the MOVING TIME metaphor for the perfective or the MOVING EGO metaphor for the imperfective (for a discussion of the two time metaphors see Radden 1991:17ff). Other examples abound. Traditional analyses of Polish case by Kempf (1978), Klemensiewicz (1926) and Szober (1923 [1963]) aimed to provide a full-fledged semantic analysis of Polish case. This type of work with its emphasis on psychologically realistic explanations, has always been "a characteristic feature of Polish (Slavic?) linguistics" (Tabakowska 2001:12; translation – A.K.), and continues to constitute an important source of insight and inspiration for cognitive research in the area of Polish case.

In order to appreciate properly how cognitive linguistics resonates in the Czech context, it is necessary to outline some basic facts pertinent to the history of the Czech language and the development of linguistic ideas in Prague. The Czech language had been excluded from the public arena for nearly two hundred years and seemed headed for extinction when Josef Dobrovský published a grammar of the language in 1809. Unbeknownst to him, the Czech national revival was to follow shortly thereafter, and his grammar was used to revive Czech and to restore its use in official domains. In order to achieve this the vocabulary of the language needed to be enriched, and metaphorical extension and metonymy played an important role. Lexical creations attributed to Josef Jungmann (the central figure in this process) include *odstín* 'nuance, shade of meaning' (a metaphorical extension from *stín* 'shadow') and *savec* 'mammal' (a metonymical creation with a literal meaning of 'one that sucks'). Thus, the idea that metaphor and metonymy play an important role in language remains beyond doubt for Czech scholars. In 1928-1939 the Prague Linguistic Circle boasted famous Russian and Czech linguists who collaborated on developing a structuralist framework that in the post-WWII era evolved into linguistic functionalism. These linguistic models contained concepts similar to category structure and center (a.k.a. prototype) vs. periphery distinctions (Vaňková et al. 2005: 33-34; Janda 1993b). The recognition of the role of pragmatics in linguistics is a consistent theme in the history of Czech linguistics and likewise provides a point of contact for cognitive linguistics.

Close affinities between the ideas developed within traditional Slavic linguistics and the assumptions of the cognitive paradigm are also clearly visible in Russian linguistics, especially in writings by followers of the Moscow Semantic School.[1] Cognitive linguists study how the structure of

---

[1] This is, of course, an oversimplification of the situation. Where cognitive linguists recognize the crucial role the (structure and functioning of the human) brain plays in language and strive both to implement cognitive findings in their linguistic models as well as to inform cognitive science with their linguistic findings, linguists belonging to the Moscow Semantic School do not show great interest in the cognitive physiological and psychological side of language. This difference in focus results in differences in heuristic methodology. According to the Moscow Semantic School, combinability of words signals combinability of concepts (Rakhilina 2000: 10-11). Russian cognitive linguists therefore claim that a cognitive approach to language "should rely on the experience of all native speakers, as it is consolidated in their language, and that experience reveals itself in the linguistic behavior of the lexeme, above all in its combinatorial possibilities"

language is dependent on our physiology, and our interaction with the environment. Langacker (1987a: 47) argues that language-specific semantic structure, made up of "conventional imagery", must be distinguished from a universal conceptual structure. "Lexicon and grammar are storehouses of conventional imagery, which differs substantially from language to language. (…) It is therefore a central claim of cognitive grammar that meaning is language-specific to a considerable extent. It is this imagery that has to be described, not the presumably universal cognitive representations that these conventional images construe". In the Russian tradition a similar idea is expressed by the term "anthropocentrism" (Rakhilina 2000: introduction): language is tailored by human beings to their needs. Followers of the Moscow Semantic School propound that language structures on all levels reflect the collective experience of the speakers of a language, and thus linguistic data provide a "linguistic world view" (Rakhilina 2000: 10-11), shared by the speakers of that language.

Politics have played a crucial role in bringing the Slavic linguistic tradition and the cognitive paradigm close to each other. Political circumstances in Slavic-speaking countries during the Cold War era forced many linguists into exile. Among them was one individual who had an enormous impact on Slavic linguistics: Roman Jakobson. Despite his own experiments with formalist descriptions (such as the one-stem verb system), Jakobson was sympathetic to many functionalist ideas that would later form the core of the cognitive linguistic framework (cf. Janda 1993b). Jakobson's presence shielded Slavic linguistics in the West, especially in the US in the 1980s, from being entirely consumed by mainstream formalism which almost eclipsed all other approaches. It should also be mentioned that the Cold War era was the time when Eastern European linguists in general and Russian linguists in particular were largely isolated from theoretical discussions in the West, due in part to the politically unrestrained writings of Chomsky, which led to the censorship of his entire oeuvre. As a consequence, East-European linguists were never forced to experiment with autonomous theories of language, but rather maintained

---

(Rakhilina 2000: 353). In other words, as opposed to American and European cognitive linguists who more and more frequently resort to psycholinguistic methods to investigate conceptual structure, Russian linguists believe we should rely on linguistic evidence of conceptual structure (cf. Rakhilina 2000: 10-11). In addition, Moscow school linguists' work is corpus-illustrated rather than corpus-based, i.e. they search corpora to supplement their intuitions, despite the availability of large national corpora and the flourishing of computational and mathematical linguistics.

focus on the form-meaning relationship and how it is embedded in the larger reality of human experience. They turned their energies inward, developing their own home-grown traditions, some of which became known in the West. These include the Russian Smysl<->Tekst framework, first developed by Mel'čuk (1995, 1999) in Moscow and the Natural Semantic Metalanguage theory formulated by Wierzbicka (see 1972 for the first book-length treatment). Most of the work done in Eastern Europe, however, never made it to the other side of the Iron Curtain, which is all the more regretful since analyses presented, for example, by followers of the Moscow Semantic School focus on precisely those issues that are of interest to cognitive linguistics. This is illustrated, among others, by the work done on metaphor by Arutjunova (1999) or on polysemy and synonymy by Apresjan (Apresjan 1974 and 1995). The data presented and the conclusions drawn are so relevant to cognitive linguistics that it has been claimed only a list of terminological equivalents is needed to bridge the gap (Rakhilina 1998).

Given that the fundamentally symbolic nature of language has always been recognized in the Slavic linguistic tradition, one might doubt that cognitive linguistics would have something to offer researchers working on Slavic languages. After all, trying to look at Slavic data from a cognitive linguistic perspective could be considered as merely recasting old ideas, revamping them using a perhaps more fashionable vocabulary, with no real gain as far as depth of understanding or explanatory power is concerned. We believe, however, that this line of reasoning is misguided in several important respects. It is of course short-sighted to assume that every theoretical claim made or assumption put forward by cognitive linguists has the character of a truly revolutionary idea that was entirely alien to and perhaps even unthinkable in the "pre-cognitive" linguistic world. Quite to the contrary, it seems that when the evolution of linguistic thought is looked at from a sufficient distance, one finds more continuity than expected (cf. Geeraerts 1988). Progress in linguistic science seems to resemble an upward spiral movement. In a sense, we move in circles and return to those places we have visited before, albeit that, with each new lap, we reach a higher level. It is our deep conviction that the theoretical framework of the cognitive paradigm has the potential to move research in the domain of Slavic languages a level up, where precise and detailed descriptions of the conceptual import of multiple linguistic structures can be offered, where numerous and diverse linguistic phenomena can be characterized in terms of a limited number of well-attested general underlying cognitive mechanisms, where the workings of languages cannot

only be meticulously described, but can also seen as motivated by things bigger than language itself – by the general human cognitive make-up, by our biological, social, and cultural experience of the world, etc.

In the remaining part of this introduction we would first like to consider some of the attractions that Slavic languages hold for cognitively-minded researchers (section 2). Then, in section 3, we will discuss some of the main theoretical assumptions of the cognitive paradigm, with special emphasis on those ideas that are particularly relevant to the research in the domain of Slavic languages presented in this volume. Finally section 4 will be devoted to an overview of the volume, which is meant as a representative selection of work, illustrating a wide array of research topics that are currently on the Slavic cognitive linguistic agenda.

2. Slavic Languages: An Ideal Laboratory for a Cognitive Linguist

Slavic languages have multiple attractions in store for a cognitive linguist, in particular in terms of the range of linguistic phenomena available. They have few, if any, peers worldwide in terms of the size of this family of languages: by any count (and the counts vary with the political allegiances of the counters) there are at least a dozen Slavic languages, spoken by close to a half billion people across an area covering over 1/6 of the dry land on Earth. Also, few languages can compete with the Slavic family as far as the documentation of their characteristics, both diachronic and synchronic is concerned. By a great stroke of luck, SS. Cyril and Methodius, the "Apostles to the Slavs", undertook their Moravian mission and thus inaugurated the development of a Slavic literary language just in time to capture a very near equivalent to Late Common Slavic, the shared language of the Slavs prior to their further linguistic differentiation. In their late ninth century translations of the gospels, these saints codified what is now known as Old Church Slavonic, a language which, despite certain Greek influences and artificial features, allows us to triangulate effectively between the modern languages and the Proto-Indo-European trunk. Thus the Slavic languages have something that even English (and its Germanic siblings) lack: a fully-documented mother tongue. Though the record is not without gaps, we do have over a thousand years of Slavic texts, enabling us to trace in detail the histories of the daughter languages, and new discoveries are still being made. Given this breath-taking affluence of the historical data available to students of Slavic languages, it is not

surprising that the present volume contains papers which are explicitly concerned with issues pertaining to diachronic language change.

The menu of potential objects for linguistic inquiry (both diachronic and synchronic) among modern Slavic languages is quite rich, thanks to the roster of linguistic categories exquisitely articulated by their inflectional and derivational morphology. The two main courses are case and aspect and some issues pertaining to both of these areas of empirical investigation are addressed in the present volume. Selecting from a long list of appetizers and side dishes that Slavic languages have in store for their connoisseurs, the volume also touches upon the proliferation of impersonal constructions in Slavic languages with special emphasis on constructions used to convey the idea of a highly diffuse and unspecified causer, on they way in which Slavic languages encode complex events,, on the means they use to convey the speaker's epistemic stance, on issues related to the relatively free word order in Slavic languages and, finally, upon sound symbolic expressions.

Obviously, the present volume merely touches upon the above-mentioned topics leaving aside a vast range of other and equally delicious specialties in the Slavic cuisine. Let us mention just a few items to whet the appetite. Bulgarian and Macedonian have retained all the inherited past tenses without compromising the distribution of aspect, yielding unexpected combinations such as imperfective aorists and perfective imperfects. The old perfect has matured in these languages into an evidential tense with a fascinating array of uses, including the "admirative". Czech is probably in the process of developing its own set of articles, oddly enough recapitulating the history of English, with the numeral *jeden* 'one' serving as the source for the indefinite article and the demonstrative *ten* 'this/that' the source for the definite article (Kresin 2001). All Slavic languages have a three-way gender distinction of masculine vs. feminine vs. neuter, usually with further distinctions within the masculine involving various construals of animacy and virility. Slavs show evidence of an enduring preoccupation with counting men, since most of their languages have special numerals and plural desinences used only with reference to male human beings. In Polish there are even special syntactic constructions just for reference to the "virile" category. Sorbian, which shares with Slovene the maintenance of the dual number, further observes a virility distinction in the dual, which is labeled in Sorbian textbooks as an opposition of "rational" (i.e., male human beings) vs. "irrational" (everything else: women, books, rabbits). Ergativity may be creeping into Polish, where the logical subjects of reflexive verbs are marked with the Accusative, not the Nominative, as in: *Brown ma doskonały styl i książkę*

się czyta szybko i przyjemnie [Brown-NOM has perfect style-ACC and the book-ACC REFL reads quickly and pleasantly] 'Brown has a perfect style and the book reads (literally 'is read') quickly and pleasantly'. Of course, one could go on listing numerous other entrees on the Slavic menu and still remain far from being exhaustive. Perhaps it is an overstatement to say "If it has happened in any language, it has happened in a Slavic language", but this claim is not far from the mark: most known linguistic phenomena do indeed have Slavic parallels.

Importantly, none of the above-mentioned and a host of other fascinating phenomena have been "overstudied" in the literature. Fortunately, several of the Slavic-speaking countries have created on-line national corpora that support searches for linguistic parameters, such as the Russian National Corpus (http://www.ruscorpora.ru), the Czech National Corpus (http://ucnk.ff.cuni.cz), the Polish National Corpus (http://www.pelcra.pl) and the Croatian National Corpus (http://www.hnk.ffzg.hr). We hope that the present volume will be instrumental in bringing the richness and beauty of Slavic languages closer to the cognitive community at large; this rapprochement would be beneficial to both the study of Slavic languages and the development of cognitive theory.

In the next section we will briefly discuss the main theoretical concepts developed so far within the cognitive paradigm, with special emphasis on those assumptions and ideas that are most directly relevant to the analyses offered in the present volume. It is thanks to theoretical concerns dictated by these assumptions that cognitively-minded linguists can find real delight in Slavic languages.

3. The theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics

3.1. A prototype approach to categorization

Over the last three decades in mainstream linguistics the conviction has grown that language is not a purely formal, algorithmic system processed in a separate language faculty. Instead, our language capacity is considered an integrated part of human cognition. The description of language is thus a cognitive discipline, part of the interdisciplinary field of cognitive sciences. One of the fundamental qualities of human cognition that is most pervasively present in language is categorization.

> "Categorization is not a matter to be taken lightly. There is nothing more basic than categorization to our thought, perception, action and speech (…) An understanding of how we categorize is central to any understanding of how we think and how we function, and therefore central to an understanding of what makes us human" (Lakoff 1987a: 5-6).

Categorization, in other words, matters to the linguist in at least two ways, i.e. "both in its methodology and in its substance" (Taylor 1989: 1). A linguist needs categories to describe the object of investigation, and the things that linguists study also stand for categories.

The view on categorization that prevails in cognitive linguistics is no doubt Prototype Theory, introduced more than three decades ago by Eleanor Rosch (for an overview of her main psychological writings as well as diverse kinds of linguistic applications see Taylor 1995). In the Prototype Approach to categorization, concepts are categories comprising prototypical members (be they local or global), as well as more peripheral members, which constitute diverse kinds of motivated extensions from that prototype. Two such motivating mechanisms are conceptual metonymy (the mechanism of mentally accessing one entity via another (salient) entity co-occurring within the same conceptual domain – cf. e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980 ch. 8, Langacker 1993:29ff) and conceptual metaphor (partially understanding one – typically more abstract – domain of experience via another – typically more concrete – domain of experience – cf. e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Lakoff 1990, Lakoff and Johnson 1999:45ff).

Often, category members are linked, e.g. if member A is the prototype, member B will be similar to A, and member C will be similar to B, but A and C are not necessarily similar to each other. The link that exists between members in a radial category does not need to reflect any objective relatedness between the entities in reality. Instead, their conceptual relatedness is a reflection of what the human conceptualizer *experiences* as a result of his biological and cognitive make-up, as well as his bodily, social, and cultural baggage. Members of a linguistic category, e.g. interrelated senses, are linked to each other by categorizing relationships such as instantiation and extension (Langacker 1999: 101-103); both involve an act of comparison in which a standard is matched against a target. Instantiation is a limiting case of extension that arises when the discrepancy is zero. Extension constitutes recognition accomplished only with a certain amount of "strain". Extension does not occur at random, however, it implies some abstract commonality. "[T]he 'outward' growth of a lexical network by extension from prototypes is inherently associated

with its 'upward' growth by extraction of schemas" (Langacker 1987a: 373). Perceived similarities among sub-groups of members of a conceptual category are captured by schemas at various levels of abstraction, a schema being an abstract characterization that is fully compatible with all the members of the category it defines. Importantly, in the schematic network model low-level schemas are claimed to be conceptually more salient than higher-level ones, and there is no necessity to postulate the existence of the highest-level schema capturing what is common to all category members for each conceptual category. Hence, it is the norm (rather than a deviation from the norm) that there are conceptual categories with not even a single property shared by *all* category members.

Recognizing that linguistic categories can also have a prototype structure (such as e.g. meanings of linguistic expressions, grammatical constructions, syntactic classes, etc.) equips a linguist with the theoretical scaffolding on which to build a principled approach to synchronic polysemy (or synonymy, for that matter), be it the polysemy of individual morphemes, words, or grammatical constructions. The same scaffolding, when considered from a slightly different perspective, can also be viewed as a fundamental part of the theoretical apparatus that can open up new and revealing venues in the investigation of diachronic language change (Geeraerts 1997), which may be viewed as a diachronic consequence of synchronic polysemy.

3.2. A conceptual and imagistic approach to meaning

The preceding paragraph suggests that meaning in a cognitivist framework is no longer defined in terms of outside-world entities to which the expressions in question might refer, but rather in terms of conceptualizations they evoke in the minds of language users (cf. e.g. Langacker 1987a:116ff; 1988:49f). Conceptualization, in turn, should be understood as both the conceptual content and the specific construal imposed on that content by the conceptualizer (cf. Langacker 1988:58ff).

A conceptualist approach to meaning facilitates a systematic recognition and principled treatment of the subjective dimension of language: when human beings conceptualize aspects of the world around them they are often preoccupied with their own role in the conceptualization process and their own relation to the entities they conceptualize. In other words, human beings often do not merely conceive of outside entities, but rather of *themselves conceptualizing the entities in question*. This peculiarity finds important reflections in language: linguistic

expressions that speakers employ in discourse are used not only to comment on states of affairs in the outside world, but also to convey the speakers' epistemic evaluation of what they are talking about, their assessment of their relation with their interlocutors, comments pertaining to the development of the current discourse itself, etc. It is an explicitly conceptualist view of meaning that facilitates analysis of subjectivity in language in as a systematic and detailed way as the phenomenon in question deserves.

Moreover, a truly conceptualist view of meaning allows us to construct a comprehensive, principled framework for all instances of language use in which conflicting characterizations are assigned to the "same" aspects of the universe of discourse (e.g. the traditional problems associated with an analysis of the semantic behavior of expressions in the context of predicates of propositional attitudes). Cognitive linguistics has developed mental space theory (cf. e.g. Fauconnier 1985): conceived situations in the universe of discourse may be conceptualized from multiple vantage points. A change in vantage point may bring about a change in how the observed parts of the universe of discourse appear to the conceptualizing subject. As the growing body of work in cognitive linguistics demonstrates (cf. e.g. Cutrer 1994, Dancygier 1998, Dancygier and Sweetser 2005, Fauconnier 1997:95ff, Sweetser 1990 ch.5), the theoretical constructs postulated within mental space theory are of fundamental importance for a unified analysis of the semantics of tense, aspect, and mood, to name but a few categories.

An important aspect of the conceptualistic view of meaning is the recognition of the imagistic component of semantics, that is of the fundamental role construal plays in meaning. A precise characterization of its dimensions allows the analyst to offer detailed and rigorous characterizations of meaning contrasts among linguistic structures which are equivalent in truth-conditional terms, but nevertheless exhibit subtle yet important differences in meaning, resulting in otherwise unexplainable differences in discourse behavior. A principled account of construal is a necessary prerequisite for developing a full-fledged symbolic approach to grammar: grammatical meaning is by necessity abstract and can hardly be characterized in terms of specific conceptual content. It may, nevertheless, be insightfully analyzed in terms of the type of construal it imposes on conceived scenes, as demonstrated, for example, by the highly revealing notional characterizations of nouns and verbs elaborated by Langacker (cf. e.g. 1987b).

3.3. A usage-based approach to language

The third theoretical assumption we would like to highlight here concerns the motivation of linguistic phenomena. By rejecting the "autonomy of language" principle, cognitive linguists abandoned any intention of formulating generalizations with absolute predictability. Human behavior is not governed by deterministic laws, and language cannot be separated from other cognitive abilities, so absolute predictability cannot be achieved. This turns out to be an advantage. The cognitive linguist is freed from the task of looking for deterministic rules, and is thus able to find cognitive motivations behind linguistic facts and to discover that these facts "make sense" within a pattern larger than language itself – the pattern of how intelligent creatures strive to understand the world around them and how they communicate their insights to others of their kind.

Yet, if there are no deterministic rules to discover and learn, then how do children acquire language and what are linguists looking for? In the usage-based approach propounded by cognitive linguists, knowledge of a language emerges from actual usage, i.e. as the result of the entrenchment and abstraction of patterns that recur in multiple usage events. A usage-based view of language structure offers a promising framework for a cognitive approach to first language acquisition (cf. e.g. Dąbrowska 2004, Tomasello 2003). At the same time, a usage-based view provides the right perspective for the full appreciation of corpus studies in linguistic research that no longer asks whether a certain phenomenon is possible or impossible, but instead focuses on how likely or unlikely the pattern is to occur (see Gries and Stefanowisch 2006).). Last but not least, the adoption of the usage-based model is important for the study of language change, as it lays the ground for recognizing the role that is played in linguistic historical evolution by factors such as frequency and mechanisms such as context-bound pragmatic inferencing.

4. Why Cognitive Linguists Should Read This Volume

The purpose of the present volume is twofold. On the one hand, we want to investigate to what extent the theoretical framework and analytic tools developed within cognitive linguistics can be insightfully applied to the study of Slavic languages. As may be apparent from the brief discussion in section 2 above, Slavic languages, with their rich inflectional morphology in both the nominal and the verbal system, provide an

important testing ground for a linguistic theory that seeks the conceptual motivation behind grammatical phenomena. On the other hand, the specific observations and insights arrived at in the course of cognitively-oriented analyses of diverse phenomena in Slavic languages may enrich the understanding of already established aspects of the cognitive model of language and serve as catalysts for their further development and refinement.

This volume is important for a number of reasons. First, as far as its descriptive range is concerned, the volume deals with a variety of empirical phenomena that are of major interest to any linguistic theory. As mentioned above, the topics discussed include the semantics of case, tense, and aspect, complex event conceptions, voice phenomena, word order, sound symbolism, and language change. Secondly, the analyses address a variety of theoretical issues that are important for cognitive linguistics in general. Among them the reader will find: the role of virtual entities in language, the importance of subjectification in motivating both synchronic polysemy and diachronic language change, different ways of conveying the speaker's epistemic attitude, various kinds of non-prototypical event conceptions and their grammatical reflections, the role of metaphor in grammaticalization, and the influence exerted by local, contextual factors of pragmatic nature in diachronic morphosyntactic change. Topics of general theoretical interest also include the issue of iconicity in language and the idea that overtly occurring language structures are "hints" helping language users construct and manipulate complex configurations of mental spaces with differing epistemic status. Finally, it should also be mentioned that the studies collected in this volume incorporate insights from a variety of theoretical frameworks that together form cognitive linguistics proper, such as e.g. cognitive grammar, mental space theory, construction grammar, frame semantics, grammaticalization theory and prototype semantics with special emphasis on its applicability to historical semantics. It is the diversity of this volume on both the empirical and theoretical level that makes it appealing to the cognitive community at large.

The contributions we have selected offer a representative sample of current research in cognitively oriented Slavic linguistics, touching upon five areas of interest to both Slavic linguists and cognitive linguists in general: (i) the highly developed nominal system with its extensive case morphology; (ii) the rich verbal system with its aspectual markers and multiple tense distinctions; (iii) clausal syntax as a reflection of how the events are construed for the purpose of linguistic communication; (iv) strategies of change that illustrate how the current systems have come into

existence and how they are likely to change; and finally, (v) motivations for the structure of the existing systems, as offered by principles such as iconicity.

Ad (i) this volume presents two articles devoted to case. Israeli's article is a detailed analysis of contextual factors that motivate the choice of the Instrumental rather than the Nominative in Russian predicates with the copula *byt'*. She argues that the decision of the speaker to represent events as or as if observed triggers the Nominative in the predicate. Focus on something other than the participant described, or on time comparison and on time limitation, trigger the Instrumental. In turn, Mitkovska's study explores a conceptual motivation for the double marking of possession in Macedonian constructions in which the Dative appears together with a possessive pronoun. She argues that the double marking of possession is motivated pragmatically, i.e. by the need of the speaker to present the possessive relationship from the perspective of the possessor and to highlight the possessed.

Part Two deals with issues pertaining to the semantics of tense and aspect markers in Slavic languages. Janda presents an empirical study of the aspectual behavior of borrowed verbs in Russian. She finds that 40% of them are imperfective, whereas 60% are bi-aspectuals that do not exhibit the traditional imperfective/perfective distinction. The strong correlation between the aspectual profile of a borrowed verb and its tendency to form *po-* prefixed perdurative verbs reveals the influence the lexical semantics of a borrowed verb plays in determining whether it will be recognized as a bi-aspectual or a more ordinary simplex imperfective verb. The article by Geld and Zovko-Dinković is an analysis of the non-present uses of the present tense in Croatian. The authors suggest that the link between these uses and the prototypical present-time meaning is the notion of epistemic immediacy. In turn, Kochańska's paper considers the respective epistemic values of the Polish perfective and imperfective aspect in the past and the non-past tense. The epistemic meanings of the two aspectual variants are analyzed as motivated extensions from their prototypical senses. The author's claim is that although each of the two aspectual variants exhibits conflicting epistemic behaviors in the past and in the non-past tense, this may be accounted for by taking into consideration the prototypical meanings of both aspects and how they interact with the epistemic values of past, present and future time frames. The last study in this part, by Dancygier and Trnavac, is a mental-space analysis of conditionals in Polish and Serbian, with reference to English. Data from temporal, conditional, and coordinate constructions in Polish and Serbian are used to establish the

basic formal and semantic parameters defining conditional meaning. In contrast to English, Polish and Serbian rely less on conjunctions and clause order, and more on tense, mood and aspectual forms, as well as on overt markers of sequentiality.

The next section, Part Three, contains two articles dealing with questions of how clausal syntax reflects the way in which events are conceptualized. Divjak's article investigates degrees of verb integration, as well as factors motivating them in the case of the [$V_{FIN}V_{INF}$] construction in Russian. Assuming a strong correlation between syntactic and semantic structure, and playing on the human capacity to impose alternate structurings on a conceived phenomenon, she provides evidence for a cline of eight different degrees of integration between the events expressed by means of a [V_{FIN} V_{INF}]. In turn, Słoń's article deals with the use of a Polish impersonal construction, namely the 3rd SG NEUTR construction, that defocuses a non-human and inanimate instigator. She shows that this construction is used when the instigator is particularly diffuse and difficult to identify.

Part Four of the volume is concerned with issues pertaining to language change. Fried's study analyzes mechanisms of morphosyntactic change on the basis of the diachronic evolution of the Old Czech 'long' present active participle *věřící* '(the one) believing' in relation to the polysemous verb *věřiti* from which it is derived. She concludes that the relative survival rates of individual uses is determined by a relative equilibrium between polysemy and isomorphism. Dickey's paper applies principles of prototype semantics to explain the development of the Russian prefix *po-* from a primarily resultative prefix to a delimitative prefix. He argues that the development of modern Russian delimitatives followed the development of *po-* as a perfectivizing prefix for determinate motion verbs. The last study in this part, by Bužarovska, focuses on the semantic change of the indefinite pronoun *nešto* into an epistemic mitigation modal in Macedonian, within a wider Balkan Slavic context. She suggests that the strengthening of invited inferences and subjectification were the two cognitive mechanisms that played a major role in this metonymically-based process.

Finally, Part Five addresses the issue of iconic motivation in language. Tabakowska's article investigates the ordering of multiple (mainly double) adjectival modifiers within Polish nominal phrases. The structure of these NPs is shown to depend on the traditional division of adjectives into two categories: the characterizing (attributive) and the specifying (restrictive). The borderline between the two, however, is fuzzy, with the allotment of an

adjective to one or the other category depending on communicative needs, which are often discourse-sensitive. In turn, Fidler focuses on sound symbolic expressions (SSEs) in Czech and investigates how SSEs relate to grammar. By analyzing how SSEs develop into discourse-aspectual markers, she contributes to our understanding of processes of word derivation and variation in language.

References

Apresjan, Ju.D. 1995. *Избранные труды. Том 1, Лексическая Семянтикя.* Moskva: Škola "Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury".

Apresjan, Ju.D. 1974. Regular polysemy. In: *Linguistics. An international review* 142:5-32.

Arutjunova, Nina D. 1999. *Язык и мир человека.* Moskva: Škola "Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury". [2nd corrected edition].

Cienki, Alan. 1989. *Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish, and Russian*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Cutrer, Michelle. 1994. "Time and Tense in Narrative and in Everyday Language". San Diego: University of California doctoral dissertation.

Dancygier, Barbara. 1998. *Conditionals and Prediction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dancygier, Barbara and Eve Sweetser. 2005. *Mental Spaces in Grammar: Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dąbrowska, Ewa. 1997. *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2004. Language, Mind and Brain: Some Psychological and Neurological Constraints on Theories of Grammar. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fauconnier, Gilles. 1985. *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Fauconnier, Gilles. 1997. *Mappings in Thought and Language.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Geeraerts Dirk. 1988. Cognitive Grammar and the History of Lexical Semantics. In: Brygida Rudzk-Osteyn (ed.). *Topics in Cognitive Iinguistics*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 647-677.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 1997. *Diachronic Prototype Semantics.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gries, St.Th & A. Stefanowitsch. 2006. *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis.* Berlin & New York : Mouton de Gruyter.

Harrison, K. David. 2006. *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janda, Laura A.1986. *A Semantic Analysis of the Russian Verbal Prefixes za-, pere-, do-, and ot-*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Janda, Laura A.1993a. *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Janda, Laura A. 1993b. "Cognitive Linguistics as a Continuation of the Jakobsonian Tradition: The Semantics of Russian and Czech Reflexives". In Maguire, Robert A. and Alan Timberlake (eds.) *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists in Bratislava*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 310-319.

Janda, Laura A. and Steven J. Clancy. 2002. *The Case Book for Russian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Kempf, Zdzisław. 1978. *Próba teorii przypadków* [An attempt at a theory of cases]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 1926. Orzecznik przy formach osobowych *być* [Predicate with personal forms of *być* 'be' *Prace filologiczne* [Philological works] XI. 123 – 181.

Koschmieder, Erwin. 1934. *Nauka o aspektach języka polskiego w zarysie. Próba syntezy.* [An attempt at a comprehensive theory of Polish aspects. An outline]. Wilno.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1990. "The Invariance Hypothesis: Is Abstract Reason Based on Image-Schemas?". *Cognitive Linguistics* 1. 39-74.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987a. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. *Theoretical Prerequisites.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987b. "Nouns and Verbs". *Language* 63. 53-94.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1988. "A View of Linguistic Semantics". In Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida (ed.). 49-90.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1993. "Reference-Point Constructions". *Cognitive Linguistics* 4. 1-38.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1999. *Grammar and Conceptualization.* Berlin & New York : Mouton de Gruyter.

Mel'čuk, Igor', A. 1995. *Русский язык в модели"смысл ↔ текст"*. Moskva: Škola "Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury" [Wiener Slawistische Almanach Sonderband 39]

Mel'čuk, Igor', A. 1999. *Опыт теории лингвистических моделей "смысл ↔ текст"*. Moskva: Škola "Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury".

Radden, Guenter. 1991. "The Cognitive Approach to Natural Language". *L.A.U.D. Papers* Series A, No. 300. Linguistic Agency of the University of Duisburg.

Rakhilina, Ekaterina V. 1998. "Kognitivnaja semantika: istorija, personalii, idei, resul'taty" *Semiotika i informatika* 36. 274-323.

Rakhilina, Ekaterina V. 2000. *Когнитивный анализ предметных имен: семантика и сочетаемость.* Moskva: Russkie Slovari.
Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida (ed.). 1988. *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida. 1992. "Case Relations in Cognitive Grammar: Some Reflexive Uses of the Polish Dative". *Leuvense Bijdragen* 81. 327-373.
Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida. 1996. "The Polish Dative". In Van Belle, William and Willy Van Langendonck (eds.). *The Dative*. Vol. 1. *Descriptive Studies.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 341-394.
Szober, Stanisław. 1923 [1963]. *Gramatyka języka polskiego* [A grammar of Polish]. Warszawa. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2001. "Kognitywizm: Obrazki z polskiej sceny" [Cognitivism. Images from the Polish scene]. *Glossos* 1 at http://seelrc.org/glossos/.
Taylor, John, R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.*
Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a Language. A Usage Based Theory of Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Vaňková, Irena, Iva Nebeská, Lucie Saicová Římalová and Jasňa Šlédrová. 2005. *Co na srdci, to na jazyku: Kapitoly z kognitivní lingvistiky*. Prague: Karolinum.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1972. *Semantic Primitives*. Frankfurt: Athenäum.